

BLOOD AND IRON

XX
Number 11, November 13, 1972. Blood and Iron is devoted to multi-player "conflict simulations," especially Diplomacy variants. Subscriptions 8/\$1, sample issue 15¢ from the editor-publisher, Lewis Pulsipher, 329 Twin Towers, Albion, MI 49224. BI is affiliated with the Michigan Organized Wargamers and its games are guaranteed by that group. This is Orion Press Publication #29.
XX

Due to unforeseen circumstances this issue will be much larger than anticipated. And since much of it is being typed a week before the deadline in large part, there may be some disorganization. A few announcements:

1. The gamefee for Fred Winter's 9-man game in Carbon 13 is \$3, not \$6 as listed in the rulesheet.
2. November is Be Kind To Bean..er, Dean Schwass Month. The report concerning November in Boast was, as usual, erroneous.
3. Somehow Len Lakofka was able to grade my publications C+ in a recent issue of his Liaisons Dangereuses without having received one from me in months. I don't have any subbers in the Chicago area either (or did not until the last couple weeks). Hmmm... This was before BI 8 was published, I think.
4. On November 26 Herb Barents will host a minicon at Valley State College. Details will be in the next Boast. Lou Zocchi has contributed two Star Trek battle manuals and a copy of his Battle of Britain Revision to be given away at the con.
5. For those following Peery's tribulations, Boast 20 may prove interesting. Herb Barents ranks Peery in his RipOff column. Meanwhile, Peery and Pulsipher make peace... Heh, maybe we should gang up on Barents...

Seriously, let's get back to IDA:

Lawrence Wm. Peery, Box 8416, San Diego, Calif. 92102.

I have read with interest Mr. Pulsipher's remarks in Blood and Iron 9/10.

First, I owe Mr. Pulsipher a public apology for some of my personal remarks in my response to his previous comments. It is so tendered. Second, I wish to thank him for the manner in which he presented my remarks in his last issue. It was done in an exceptionally meritorious manner. I appreciate it.

Third, I hope that Mr. Pulsipher will continue the discussion of the issues regarding IDA he has recently raised. They merit the fullest discussion.

Fourth, My only hope, personally, is that in the future all who take part in this discussion will devote their talents to the issues involved and not in a fruitless discussion of personalities and side issues.

Such a discussion would be, I feel, of great value if conducted in the proper manner.

Peery (sorry, I'm averse to use of titles) also sent along a confidential letter. While we may not agree, I think we can at least

live together peacefully -- and the IDA discussions in BI will continue.

* * *

While the following does not directly concern IDA (Edi did not have time to comment much on that), it does clarify something discussed last issue.

Edi Birsan, c/o Pat Verteramo, RD 5 Box 6 Bridge St., Hopewell Jct.

...As for the 17% Win Only characteristics of the TDA tourney... I think I failed to communicate properly. Everyone agrees that to win is the best alternative. What happens after that is where the dispute comes in. Only 17% or so agree that if you can not win then any tie situation with any number of players is better than second place. About an equal number feel directly opposed; that second place is better than any tie. The rest of us are scattered between these polls. The TDA tourney by rewarding only wins and ties thus qualifies as a Win Only tourney in that there is no incentive or reward for that group of people who feel that second place is a valuable position.

Lew here. I see what you mean, but I do not see how one could organize a tournament with only one game in the first round which rewards second place as well as draw. If you allow all winners, "drawers," and "second placeers" to enter the final round, you may be stuck with the wrong number of players, and certainly too many for a single game. In the absence of clear superiority, that is, in the absence of a win, a draw must be best since you can't have a second. This is just another reason to avoid a tournament of this type, I guess. Persons who want to know more about the statistics involved in this question should get the latest issue of Edi's 'zine Arena, which contains the first installment of his analysis of a poll of players' views which Edi recently conducted.

@ @ @

Someone recently asked me to comment on Walt Buchanan's remarks in Hoosier Archives 93 concerning the Archives Publishers Poll and MOW. I believe this refers to a few sentences Walt threw in with his analysis of the poll results. That's what I'll be talking about, anyway.

Several courses were available to Walt; he probably chose the course most likely to help preserve the Archives and Beyerlein Polls by simply pointing out that four Michigan GM's, all members of MOW, had voted for almost identical top boards, and noting that it shows that there is strength in numbers. We would have been even stronger, but one of our number failed to vote. But by the deadline of the next APP we may have two more who will be able to vote. We cannot seriously deny that we acted together. We collectively came up with the idea at an MOW meeting in September -- I say collectively because more than one of us had considered "packing" the polls before. We did so for a number of reasons. Mine were that it would be a good joke, and it would be interesting to see how Walt would react. Another was that we illustrated that, while the polls may be an excellent method for determining some sort of ranking, when ideally conducted (though I think at least one of us would disagree there), the polls are not accurate now and open to manipulation. It will be interesting to see what reaction results from the packing. Will others tend not to vote for the participants, or will they vote for some of us because we've received support in earlier polls?

I had considered voting for completely unknown players who have not exhibited unusual skill, but we chose five of the better players from the state instead. After all, Van Andel has been mentioned before, and I have been on the second board without help from the rest of the state.

I'd like to hear what some of you think about this.

@ @ @

'ZINE REVIEWS

The Flying Buffalo's Favorite Magazine, published bimonthly by Richard Loomis, 8149 E Thomas Rd., Scottsdale, Ariz 85251. \$2/yr.

#8 (Sept. 72) contains the rating list for all Nuclear Destruction players and a number of articles: "Political-economies of Factory Building & Play" by Lee Childs, "Description of ND game #17" by the editor-publisher; a letter from Arn Vagts, a page of advertisements from subbers (free up to 35 words), and "Projected Approx Industrial Production Analysis" by Tom Webster. All but the last deal with Nuclear Destruction; Webster's article is devoted to Battle Plan. TFBFM deals only with the games Loomis is running by mail (by computer), and includes announcements to the players as well as articles. The ad page is interesting. Back issues are 35¢ each if you'd like to try it. Printing is reduced offset.

El Dorado, published irregularly, edited by Dick Vedder, 1450 N Cherry Ave., Tucson, Ariz. 85719. This ditto 'zine is up in the air after the first three issues because the publisher, Rod Walker, has left the hobby. However, Dick intends to publish a fourth issue somehow to take care of his initial commitment to four issues for \$1. El Dorado includes supply center charts for many variant Diplomacy games, beginning with the oldest, and Dick's VEGA (Variant Equation Game Analysis) rating system for variants. The first three issues only begin to take care of the center charts, but the first VEGA listing is included in #3, and a listing of all variant designations is included in #1. Thanks for saving me all that work, Dick. Anyone who is at all interested in variant Diplomacy should sub to this 'zine. I hope that efforts such as this will remove variant Dippydom from its current "ignored younger sister" status in Dippydom as a whole.

@ @ @

The following comes from an MOW column I recently wrote for Boast and Yggdrasill Chronicle. It has been altered in a few places.

Krupp I, by Richard Wright, is a seven player variant of Avalon Hill's Panzerblitz. Each player controls one "Duchy" (a city, supply capacity for building new units, and initial forces). Because movement is simultaneous and there are many units, FTF play would be mechanically difficult. Postal play would be more practical, and this would also allow use of options for hidden movement, blind indirect fire, etc. I have a copy of the rules and permission to make them available to MOW members, but unless there is some interest I will not bother. I'll try to take the rules to future MOW meetings so that others can look the game over.

Midgard 2 is an adaptation by Tom Drake, #4K, USU Apartments, Logan, Utah 84321 of Midgard, a British sword and sorcery game designed by science fiction fans. M 2 differs from most games in that there is no intention of producing a winner. Instead, it provides a framework on which the players can act as characters such as wizards, kings,

or heroes. The rules are long and very detailed, but there is still room for changes and additions with the agreement of the GM. In fact, the GM will probably have more influence on this game than on any other game I know of, with the possible exception of the Godawful game. Tom has filled one game with about 35 players, and has found GM's for possibly two more sections. I personally think that the GM will be driven mad by the mass of detail, but Tom has done a good job of setting up the game and writing the rules.

Let me give some examples of the detail involved. There is a die roll for weather in each weather zone each turn (= one week). Each player disposes financial resources which can be used for basic necessities, purchase of transport, hiring of mercenaries or payment of native troops (by rulers), building of fortifications (as well as maintenance), etc. There is a religion of sorts, complete with holy days which cut the movement factor. Various magical objects are hidden throughout the world, and presumably treasures are concealed as well. Wizards may conjure elementals or demons, and of course may cast a variety of spells. Army rules are detailed, but players have only strategic control -- the GM must fight the battles using orders from the players.

Rules are 50¢ from Tom.

@ @ @

Here is the latest listing of active variant Diplomacy games.

1968	
Rbu	Youngstown Variant (UTOPIA) *
1969	
Abu	Youngstown Variant (UTOPIA) *
Qbh	Brave New World (BRAVE NEW WORLD)
1970	
Bbp	Godawful Game
Dcj	Aberration IV (ZOTHIQUE)*
Fck	Scotice Scripti II (DIPLOPHOBIA -carbon copy at present)
1971	
Av	Calhamer 5-man game (BLEFESCU)*
Bcm	Hypereconomic Diplomacy II (SIBERIAN)
Dbu	Youngstown Variant (UTOPIA)*
Fcd	Aberration III (ZOTHIQUE)*
Gcd	Aberration III (ZOTHIQUE)*
Hcn	Imperialism IXR (CAPHTOR)*
Iv	Calhamer 5-man game (BLEFESCU)*
Jv	Calhamer 5-man game (BLEFESCU)*
Kco	Abstraction (COURIER)
Lcp	The Great European War
Mbu	Youngstown Variant (SHAAFT!!)
Rcv	Youngstown Variant, second revision (SHAAFT!!)
Ses	"Fistel Variant" (SHAAFT!!)
Tbu	Youngstown Variant (ON LES AURA)
Uct	Diadochi I (WAR BULLETIN)
1972	
Abu	Youngstown Variant (BOAST)
Bcw	Balance of Power Variant (SHAAFT!!)
Ccn	Imperialism IXR (THERMOPOLAE)
Dcx	War of the Rings Diplomacy I (JASTRZAB)
Edb	Youngstown Variant (MARCUS)
Gcz	Atlantica (BUSHWACKER)

Hcn Imperialism IXR (THERMOPOLAE)
 Ida Myopia (XL)
 Jco Abstraction (BUSHWACKER)
 Kco Abstraction (ETHIL THE FROG)
 Lbu-Ubu Youngstown Variant (THUNDERBIRD)
 Vbu Youngstown Variant (YGGDRASILL CHRONICLE)
 Wdd Diadochi II (DER KRIEG)
 Xt Middle Earth IV (VOICE OF THE NORTH)
 Yw Cline 9-man game (RENAME)
 Zbu Youngstown Variant (CRUSH)
 AAdc Winter 9-man game (CARBON 13)

There are also some Imperialism VII and VIIR games which have been revived by Paul Bond, but I do not have the numbers at hand.

Removed since last list:

67AAag Anarchy III (Dan Alderson GM) -- no one seems to know what happened to this one, but it must be over by now.
 69Ccb: Won by Lew Pulsipher (Oop, Continent, SHAAFT!!) Columbia.
 70Es: Abandoned by GM, will probably be cancelled due to player disinterest in reviving it (Scottomacy, (RAMSEY DIPLOMAT))
 71Ccu: Youngstown Variant, first revision, OMNIFARIOUS. Abandoned.
 710v: Calhamer 5-man game, OMNIFARIOUS. Abandoned.
 71Pcu: As Ccu.
 71Wbu: Youngstown Variant, RUNNING RIVER, abandoned but may be revived.
 #71Vct: Diadochi I, QUO VADIS, won by H. Gullet, Carthage.
 72Fcy: Anonymity II, IMPASSABLE. This game was a fake. I deplore this sort of thing, which wasted my time and which created another hole in the system. Unfortunately John has not seen fit to start an actual game to at least fill the space.

Other changes: I have assigned 71Xbu to an unnumbered game in RUNNING RIVER, formerly from the JOURNAL, I think, of the Youngstown Variant. This has been abandoned but may be revived.

The 10-man 10-game YV tourny in THUNDERBIRD has been changed to bu from db. Unfortunately Mark Weidmark has had a lot of trouble deciding what revision of YV he is using. My notes say the games are now bu, but they may be cv instead.

72Wdd was formerly incorrectly given db, which, while no longer applying to the THUNDERBIRD games, applies to the MARCUS YV.

Also note that I originally assigned Jco and Kco in a reverse order, but listed them as above on the last list, which served as notification to John Piggott; since Fred Davis changed his number to Jco, I've let the error stand.

Note that the "#" with 71Vct, which indicates a local game, is an integral part of the number. It is incorrect to call the game "1971Vct."

@ @ @

More on the IDA

A lot of people either did not believe, or can not accept, my statement in the last issue that I will not run for office in the IDA. If that is not enough for you people, I hope the following will be. It should also give some of the readers an idea of who they've become associated with.

Even if I had the will to run for and serve as an officer in IDA, I do not think I could find time to do a good job without slowly going crazy. I am a college senior and am currently trying to decide which graduate school to attend. I'm in history, because I enjoy it, but that also means that to find a job I'll have to

do a bang-up job all the way through grad school. Since I may have trouble adjusting, I want to cut down my wargaming activities so that I can devote my time to school during the first year. Right now I work 15-20 hours a week as well as carry the usual load. Aside from personal matters I also publish Blood and Iron, Supernova, and Black Host, I GM 1971V in Mars Vigila, I write a column for Boast and Yggdrasill Chronicle, and I play in 12 postal Diplomacy-type games. I formerly GMed two carbon-copy regular Diplomacy games and poured a lot of time into MOW (I still do, but not as much). I have already cut out those activities, along with 6 other postal Dippy games. Maybe some people could take this load and still have lots of extra time, but I cannot. And what extra time I do have I would like to devote to articles and game design.

I hope that helps clarify things. I have not even definitely decided to rejoin IDA, though I probably will in order to watch developments concerning variants, for which I feel responsible, and concerning sanctions, which may effect MOW guarantees. Someone said that I owe it to Dippydom to run for office in IDA; aside from the assumption, which is open to some question, that serving as an officer in IDA would be in the interest of Dippydom, I think I am doing more for the hobby than most people by taking care of the Miller numbers, providing variant information, and finding homes for orphan variants on behalf of the PDC.

Enough of that. I am becoming disturbed about the IDA Ombudsman position and its influence. I believe a Commission on Ethics has been set up recently by the President of the IDA which may look into the matter, but in the meantime we have players in various 'zines appealing to the IDA Ombudsman concerning the actions of the GM's in those 'zines. As it happens, the two I know of both concern GM's who are IDA members. But I wonder, what is IDA policy toward GM's who are not IDA members? For example, what if I do not rejoin IDA, and one of my players appeals a ruling to the Ombudsman. Is he going to make a ruling? And if he does, and I ignore it, what will IDA do about it? Moreover, if I AM an IDA member and ignore the ruling, what will the IDA do? I think these are important questions. While I respect Edi Birsan's judgement, he is only one person. Why should he, or anyone, have some authority to overrule a GM, or even to make a ruling with some sort of official support without a request from the GM concerned? Or is the ruling only made upon request of the GM? I do not know, and I do not think an official policy has been established. I would like to see this done, however, even if the policy established is only temporary, until the new Commission presents its findings. I have been considering a special house rule which will act as a counter to outside interference from any organization, but have not established any as yet. I hardly expect that such a situation could arise, and in that sense I am being an alarmist. But GMing is a long-term business, and I don't wish to have apprehensions about what will happen a year from now.

The IDA also may soon discuss sanctioning and/or recommending Diplomacy 'zines. But more on that will have to wait.

@ @ @

Miller Numbers again. I have a short note from Mark Weidmark which will admirably start this section.

Mark Weidmark, 528 Park Crescent, Pickering, Ontario, CANADA Ag.11

...it is my decision to drop all use of assigned variant numbers. 1) I don't understand them. 2) They are too long and complicated for easy memorization without work 3) I see no present use for them 4) They turn me off 5) The players don't use the numbers and don't know them (possibly because of the one change) 6) I don't and never did like them. You can continue to list the numbers, I just won't use them...

The numbers are very easy to understand, once explained. Each variant is assigned a letter corresponding to its position in the sequence of numbers assigned (not by the time the game starts but the time the number is assigned). This letter is in upper case. The number of course is the year in which the game started. The lower case letter(s) are assigned in sequence as each new variant starts. The next new variant game to be played will receive the designation "de." When additional sections of a variant are started they receive the same lower case designation as the first. If later sections are revised, they may receive a new number if I consider it a new game. I also decide whether a game is a variant or not. Thus far no rules have been established to determine whether a game is a Diplomacy variant or not, and Don Miller assigned a number to at least one game which I would have ignored (The Godawful Game). I hope to establish a set of criteria soon. I have no trouble memorizing variant numbers, and I know no one who has. Most variant 'zines use the numbers rather than their own designations. Do you have trouble with regular numbers? If not, you should have no trouble with variant numbers. It is too bad you don't like the numbers, Mark -- no one else seems to mind. What use are they? In five years probably very few people will have any idea that game number one in Thunderbird is 71Lbu unless they have a list of all numbers in front of them. And if they don't, how will they know what rules were being used unless they read the early issues of the 'zine? Hell, they probably won't even know what Thunderbird was! The Miller numbers are simply a system of identifying variant games which everyone can use, just as the Boardman numbers serve this purpose for regular games. And a Miller number alone tells one more than a Boardman number, since it identifies the variant being played. The question is, why use your own numbers when you can use Miller numbers just as easily, and thereby cooperate with the rest of Dippydom? The least you can do is use the numbers along with your own designations. You, of all people, should be opposed to sitting in your own little world, which is what you're doing by ignoring the numbers.

More on the numbers next issue.

@ @ @

1972.23h

The above number has been assigned to this game. Please use it in the future.

1935 Attacks

Germany attacks Britain in Austria at 5-2 = 2-1. No effect. The PF chart remains the same. None of the other four players submitted moves, so if Barry Eynon wishes he may submit 1936 placements for those countries.

The deadline for 1936 placements is November 28 at noon at 329 Twin Towers, Albion, Mich. 49224. I will not be here from the 22nd to 26th.

See bottom of next page for more on this game.

The deadlines for both games are a little shorter than usual so that I can mail BI 12 in November to avoid the Christmas rush. The deadline for BI 13 will be around December 31 or even in early January.

1972.9h

1938 Placements:

GER: 10-Ger, 5-Rhi, 5-Aus, 4-Pol

US: 8-USA

BRI: 8-USA, 4-Ger, 2-Rus

FRA: 5-Bri, 5-Ger

RUS: NMR 12-Rus

	Al	Au	Ba	Br	Cz	Fr	Ge	It	Po	Rh	Ro	Ru	US
USA (Campion)									7	2			8
FRA (Hendry)	C			5			8						
BRI (Caton)		2				4	U+11			2	2	U+2	8
RUS (Eynon)			C	U+2			U+4					12	
GER (Birsan)		15	C		C		17		10	10	5		

Deadline for 1938 attacks is November 28, 1972. See 72.23h for explanation.

PRESS: (Note that I have not written any press for this game -- one reader thought that I was writing the Geneva stuff)

GENEVA, SWITZERLAND (AP): Franz Fritz stated today that in his opinion, the German menace to the peace of Europe has been contained. Germany has much power but it has missed most of its opportunities. Now the big danger is Russia, with a perfectly secure position in the Baltic States and strong positions in Britain and Germany (total now: 13 points). In contrast, France and Britain are stumbling around doing nothing. After completing his statement, Fritz was asked about the U.S. "The U.S.?" he said, "The U.S. has nothing to do with the situation." All present commented on the aptness of his remark.

Berlin to Moscow: how about a little co-operation in Romania and Old Poland?

Todd Roseman (address below) is asked to submit stand-by orders for Russia in case Barry Eynon misses again.

72.23h again. Russia places a control in the Baltic; Germany places a control in Rhi. Todd Roseman's address is now: 66 Montebello, Chula Vista, Calif. 92010.

Lewis Pulsipher
329 Twin Towers
Albion, Michigan 49224



First class

First class.

Return requested.

RICHARD HULL
4720 CLOYNE APT #2
OXNARD, CALIF. 93030